Heuristics for Planning, Plan Recognition and Parsing (Written: June 2009, Published: May 2016)

Miquel Ramírez
Departament of Technology (DTIC)
Universitat Pompeu Fabra
08018 Barcelona, SPAIN
miquel.ramirez@protonmail.ch

Hector Geffner
Departament of Technology (DTIC)
ICREA & Universitat Pompeu Fabra
08018 Barcelona, SPAIN
hector.geffner@upf.edu

arXiv:1605.05807v2 [cs.AI] 22 May 2016

Abstract

In a recent paper, we have shown that Plan Recognition over STRIPS can be formulated and solved using Classical Planning heuristics and algorithms (Ramirez and Geffner 2009). In this work, we show that this formulation subsumes the standard formulation of Plan Recognition over libraries through a compilation of libraries into STRIPS theories. The libraries correspond to AND/OR graphs that may be cyclic and where children of AND nodes may be partially ordered. These libraries include Context-Free Grammars as a special case, where the Plan Recognition problem becomes a parsing with missing tokens problem. Plan Recognition over the standard libraries become Planning problems that can be easily solved by any modern planner, while recognition over more complex libraries, including Context–Free Grammars (CFGs), illustrate limitations of current Planning heuristics and suggest improvements that may be relevant in other Planning problems too.

Introduction

Plan Recognition is a common task in a number of areas where the goal and plan of an agent must be inferred from observations of its behavior (Schmidt, Sridharan, and Goodson 1978; Cohen, Perrault, and Allen 1981; Pentney et al. 2006). Plan Recognition is a form of Planning in reverse: while in Planning, we seek the actions that achieve a goal, in Plan Recognition, we seek the goals that explain the observed actions. Work in Plan Recognition, however, has proceeded independently of the work in Planning, using mostly handcrafted libraries or algorithms not related to Planning (Kautz and Allen 1986; Vilain 1990; Charniak and Goldman 1993; Lesh and Etzioni 1995; Goldman, Geib, and Miller 1999; Avrahami-Zilberbrand and Kaminka 2005).

Recently, we have shown that Plan Recognition can be formulated and solved using Classical Planning algorithms (Ramirez and Geffner 2009). This is important since Classical Planning algorithms have become quite powerful in recent years. This formulation does not work over libraries but over STRIPS theories where a set $\mathcal{G}$ of possible goals is given. The Plan Recognition task is defined as the problem of identifying the goals $G \in \mathcal{G}$ that have some *optimal plan* compatible with the observations O. Such goals are grouped into the *optimal goal set* $\mathcal{G}^*$, $\mathcal{G}^* \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. The reason for focusing on the optimal plans is that they represent the possible behaviors of a perfectly rational agent pursuing the goal G (Baker, Tenenbaum, and Saxe 2007). By suitable transformation, it is then shown in (Ramirez and Geffner 2009) that this optimal set $\mathcal{G}^*$ can be computed *exactly* by means of optimal Planning algorithms and *approximately* by efficient suboptimal Planning algorithms and polynomial heuristics.

In this work, we show that this formulation subsumes the standard formulation of Plan Recognition over libraries through a compilation of libraries into STRIPS. The libraries correspond AND/OR graphs that may be cyclic and where children of AND nodes may be partially ordered. This libraries include Context-Free Grammars as a special case, where the Plan Recognition problem becomes a parsing problem. Plan Recognition over the standard Plan Libraries become simple Planning problems that can be easily solved by any modern planner, while recognition over more complex libraries, including CFGs, illustrate limitations of current Planning heuristics and improvements that may be relevant in other Planning problems as well.[1]

The paper is organized as follows. First we review the formulation of Plan Recognition over STRIPS theories in (Ramirez and Geffner 2009), then we consider Plan Recognition over libraries, present some experimental results, and draw some conclusions.

Plan Recognition as Planning

A STRIPS Planning problem is a tuple $P = \langle F, I, A, G \rangle$ where F is the set of fluents, $I \subseteq F$ and $G \subseteq F$ are the initial and goal situations, and A is a set of actions a with precondition, add, and delete lists $Pre(a)$, $Add(a)$, and $Del(a)$ respectively, all of which are subsets of F. For each action $a \in A$, we assume that there is a *non-negative cost* $c(a)$ so that the cost of a sequential plan $\pi = a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is $c(\pi) = \sum c(a_i)$. A plan π is *optimal* if it has minimum cost. For unit costs, i.e., $c(a) = 1$ for all $a \in A$, plan cost is plan

[1] Parsing in CFGs is polynomial while Planning is known to be NP–hard. This worst complexity bounds, however, do not imply that the reduction of parsing to Planning is necessarily a bad idea. First, many Planning problems – like manySAT problems – can be solved quite efficiently; second, parsing with constraints, as required in Natural Language Processing, is also intractable, yet many of these constraints can be handled naturally in Planning. In addition, the mapping handles missing tokens in the input sentence and yields interesting lessons for Planning heuristics.



Figure 1: Plan Recognition: Is the agent headed to C, I, or K? The observations are the transitions from A to B and F to G in that order.

length, and the optimal plans are the shortest ones. Unless stated otherwise, action costs are assumed to be 1.

Definition

The Plan Recognition problem given a *plan library* L for a set $\mathcal{G}$ of possible goals G can be understood, at an abstract level, as the problem of finding a goal G with a plan π in the library, written $\pi \in \Pi_L(G)$, such that π satisfies the observations. We define the Plan Recognition problem over a *domain theory* in a similar way just changing the set $\Pi_L(G)$ of plans for G in the library by the set $\Pi^*_P(G)$ of optimal plans for G given the domain P. We use $P = \langle F, I, O\rangle$ to represent Planning *domains* so that a Planning *problem* $P(G)$ is obtained by concatenating a Planning domain with a goal G, which is a set of fluents. We define a *Plan Recognition problem* or *theory* as follows:

Definition 1 *A Plan Recognition problem or* theory *is a triplet $T = \langle P, \mathcal{G}, O\rangle$ where $P = \langle F, I, A\rangle$ is a Planning domain, $\mathcal{G}$ is the set of possible goals G, $G \subseteq F$, and $O = o_1, \ldots, o_m$ is an* observation sequence *with each o_i being an action in A.*

We also need to make precise what it means for an action sequence to satisfy an observation sequence made up of actions. E.g., the action sequence $\pi = \{a, b, c, d, e, a\}$ satisfies the observation sequences $O_1 = \{b, d, a\}$ and $O_2 = \{a, c, a\}$, but not $O_3 = \{b, d, c\}$. This can be formalized with the help of a function that maps observation indices in O into action indices in A:

Definition 2 *An action sequence $\pi = a_1, \ldots, a_n$ satisfies the observation sequence $O = o_1, \ldots, o_m$ if there is a* monotonic *function f mapping the observation indices $j = 1, \ldots, m$ into action indices $i = 1, \ldots, n$, such that $a_{f(j)} = o_j$.*

The solution to a Plan Recognition theory $T = \langle P, \mathcal{G}, O\rangle$ is given by the goals G that admit an optimal plan that is compatible with the observations:

Definition 3 *The exact solution to a theory $T = \langle P, \mathcal{G}, O\rangle$ is given by the* optimal goal set $\mathcal{G}^*_T$ *which comprises the goals $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that for some $\pi \in \Pi^*_P(G)$, π satisfies O.*

Figure 1 shows a simple Plan Recognition problem. Room A (marked with a circle) is the initial position of the agent, while Rooms C, I and K (marked with a square) are its possible destinations. Arrows between Rooms A and B, and F and G, are the observed agent movements in that order. In the resulting theory T, the only possible goals that have optimal plans compatible with the observation sequence are I and K. In the terminology above, the set of possible goals $\mathcal{G}$ is given by the atoms $at(C)$, $at(I)$, and $at(K)$, while the optimal goal set $\mathcal{G}^*_T$ comprises $at(I)$ and $at(K)$, leaving out the possible goal $at(C)$.

Computation

In order to solve the Plan Recognition problem using Planning algorithms, we get rid of the observations. For simplicity, we assume that no pair of observations o_i and o_j refer to the same action a in P. When this is not so, we create a copy a' of the action a in P so that o_i refers to a' and o_j refers to a.

We will eliminate observations by mapping the theory $T = \langle P, \mathcal{G}, O\rangle$ into an slightly different theory $T' = \langle P', \mathcal{G}', O'\rangle$ with an *empty* set O' of observations, such that the solution set $\mathcal{G}^*_T$ for T can be read off from the solution set $\mathcal{G}^*_{T'}$ for T'.

Definition 4 *For a theory $T = \langle P, \mathcal{G}, O\rangle$, the transformed theory is $T' = \langle P', \mathcal{G}', O'\rangle$ with*

- *$P' = \langle F', I', A'\rangle$ has fluents $F' = F \cup F_o$, initial situation $I' = I$, and actions $A' = A \cup A_o$, where $P = \langle F, I, A\rangle$, $F_0 = \{p_a \mid a \in O\}$, and $A_o = \{o_a \mid a \in O\}$,*
- *$\mathcal{G}'$ contains the goal $G' = G \cup G_o$ for each goal G in $\mathcal{G}$, where $G_o = F_o$,*
- *O' is empty*

The new actions o_a in P' have the same precondition, add, and delete lists as the actions a in P except for the new fluent p_a that is added to $Add(o_a)$, and the fluent p_b, for the action b that immediately precedes a in O, if any, that is added to $Pre(o_a)$.

In the transformed theory T', the observations $a \in O$ are encoded as extra fluents $p_a \in F_o$, extra actions $o_a \in A_o$, and extra goals $p_a \in G_o$. Moreover, these extra goals p_a can only be achieved by the new actions o_a, that due to the precondition p_b for the action b that precedes a in O, can be applied only after all the actions preceding a in O, have been executed. The result is that the plans that achieve the goal $G' = G \cup G_o$ in P' are in correspondence with the plans that achieve the goal G in P *that satisfy the observations* O:

Proposition 5 *$\pi = a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is a plan for G in P that satisfies the observations $O = o_1, \ldots, o_m$ under the function f iff $\pi' = b_1, \ldots, b_n$ is a plan for G' in P' with $b_i = o_{a_i}$, if $i = f(j)$ for some $j \in [1, m]$, and $b_i = a_i$ otherwise.*

It follows from this that π is an optimal plan for G in P that satisfies the observations iff π' is an optimal plan in P' for two different goals: G, on the one hand, and $G' = G \cup G_o$ on the other. If we let $\Pi^*_P(G)$ stand for the set of optimal plans for G in P, we can thus test whether a goal G in $\mathcal{G}$ accounts for the observation as follows:[2]

[2] Note that while a plan for $G' = G \cup G_o$ is always a plan for G, it is *not* true that an *optimal* plan for G' is an *optimal* plan for G, or even that a good plan for G' is a good plan for G.

Theorem 6 *$G \in \mathcal{G}^*_T$ iff there is an action sequence π in $\Pi^*_{P'}(G) \cap \Pi^*_{P'}(G')$.*

Moreover, since $G \subseteq G'$, if we let $c^*_{P'}(G)$ stand for the optimal cost of achieving G in P', we can state this result in a simpler form:

Theorem 7 *$G \in \mathcal{G}^*_T$ iff $c^*_{P'}(G) = c^*_{P'}(G')$*

The optimal goal set $\mathcal{G}^*$ can be computed, using this result, by solving two optimal Planning problems for each possible goal G: one extending the domain P' with the goal G, the other extending P' with the goal G' made up of G and the dummy goals G_o encoding the observations. The goal G explains the observations and thus belongs to $\mathcal{G}^*_T$ iff the solutions to these two optimal Planning problems have the same cost. In (Ramirez and Geffner 2009), a more efficient method for computing this set exactly is introduced, where the cost of the first problem is used as the upper bound in the solution of the second. In addition, two methods that approximate $\mathcal{G}^*_T$ and scale up much better are presented. For Plan Recognition over libraries, the situation is simpler, as the resulting Planning problems have *zero action costs*, and hence *all plans are optimal.*

Plan Recognition over Libraries

As mentioned above, the Plan Recognition problem given a *plan library* L for a set $\mathcal{G}$ of possible goals G can be understood, at an abstract level, as the problem of finding a goal G with a plan $\pi \in L$, written $\pi \in \Pi_L(G)$, such that π satisfies the observations O. We show now that a library L for a goal G can be compiled intro a STRIPS Planning problem $P_L(G)$ so that π is in $\Pi_L(G)$ iff π is a plan for $P_L(G)$. Provided with this correspondence and *by setting the cost of all the actions in P_L to zero*, so that no plan in the library is ruled out due to their cost, a plan in the library for G will satisfy the observations O iff G is in the optimal goal set $\mathcal{G}^*_T$ of the theory $T = \langle P_L, \mathcal{G}, O\rangle$, a set that can be computed by using an off-the-shelf classical planner upon the Planning problems $P'_L(G')$ obtained from the transformation that compiles the observation O in T away.

Plan Libraries

As it is standard, we take a library L for a goal G to be a rooted, ordered AND/OR graph where each node is a AND node, an OR node, or a leaf. Leaves represent primitive task (actions), OR nodes represent non-primitive tasks, and AND nodes represent methods for decomposing non-primitive task. The children of OR nodes are AND nodes or leaves, while the children of AND nodes are OR nodes or leaves. The children of an AND node n can be ordered partially; we write $n' <_n n''$ to express that child n' of n must come before child n''. The root of the library is a task (OR node) that represents the goal G to be achieved. We will allow libraries to be cyclic, and thus, CFGs will be an special case where the OR nodes stand for the non-terminal symbols in the grammar, the AND nodes stands for the grammar rules, and the leaves stand for the grammar terminals. The children of the AND/OR graphs that represent CFGs are normally cyclic and the children of AND nodes (rules) are ordered linearly.

The set of solutions to one such AND/OR graph can be defined by means of derivations as it is common in parsing, with the only difference that a partially ordered rule $X \rightarrow Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$ represented by an AND node, stands for the set of all totally ordered rules $X \rightarrow Y_{i_1}, \ldots, Y_{i_m}$ compatible with the partial order. The set of plans $\Pi_L(G)$ in the library for G denotes the set of 'strings' (sequences of terminal tasks or actions) that can be derived from the root node corresponding to G.

Compilation

The compilation of the library L for a goal G into a STRIPS Planning problem $P_L(G)$ depends on a depth parameter N, and it ensures that the plans in $P^N_L(G)$ are in correspondence with the set of plans (strings of primitive tasks) $\Pi_L(G)$ that can be derived from the library by bounding the depth of the derivation to N. If the library is acyclic, it suffices to set N to the depth of the graph to ensure completeness; otherwise, the parameter N puts a bound on the number of derivations. For simplicity, we often drop the index N from the notation.

The Planning problem $P_L(G) = \langle F_L, I_L, G_L, A_L\rangle$ have a set of fluents F_L, initial and goal situations I_L and G_L, and actions A_L. For simplicity, we will describe the problem assuming a STRIPS language with negation. Negation, however, can be easily compiled away (Gazen and Knoblock 1997).

The fluents F_L in P_L are $started(n, i)$, $\neg started(n, i)$, $finished(n, i)$, $\neg finished(n, i)$, and $top(i)$, where n corresponds to the nodes in the AND/OR graph representing the library L, and $i = [0 \ldots N]$. The integers i aim to capture the possible levels of the stack, with the true level captured by the fluent $top(i)$ that is mutex with $top(k)$ for $k \neq i$. In a state, where $top(i)$ is true, the fluents $started(n, k)$ and $finished(n, k)$ for $k \leq i$ express the contents of the stack. In any such a state, all fluents $started(n, k)$ and $finished(n, k)$ for $k > i$ will be false.

The initial and goal situations of P_L are $I_L = \{top(0)\}$ and $G_L = \{finished(n, 0)\}$, where n is the single (OR) root node of the library L. That is, the stack starts at level 0 empty with no node started, and the goal is to finish with the root node executed at the same level. For doing this, the stack will expand and contract, while the execution of a node will allow the execution of its children. Roughly the $started(n, i)$ fluents flow downward in the graph, and the fluents $finished(n, i)$ flow upward, with the actions $start(n, i)$ and $end(n, i)$ emulating the start and ending of the primitive and non-primitive tasks in the AND/OR graph. As a convenient abbreviation, we write $i+1$ and $i-1$ to denote constants i' defined as the successor and predecessor of the constant i in the encoding. The actions in $P^N_L(G)$are:

- Calls from AND nodes n to non–terminal children n' are represented by actions $start(n, n', i)$ with preconditions

$$Pre = \{top(i), started(n, i), \neg finished(n')\}$$
$$\cup \{finished(n'', i) \,|\, n'' <_n n'\}$$
$$\cup \{\neg started(n'', i) \,|\, n'' \in children(n)\}$$

  add list $Add = \{top(i+1), started(n', i+1\}$ and delete list $Del = \{top(i)\}$. For calls to terminal children n', the precon-

dition of $start(n, n', i)$ is the same as the one described above but $Add = \{finished(n', i)\}$ and $Del = \emptyset$.

- Termination of calls made from AND nodes n are encoded with actions $end(n, i)$, with preconditions

$$Pre = \{top(i), started(n, i)\} \cup \{finished(n') \mid n' \in children(n)\}$$

and add list $Add = \{finished(n, i-1), top(i-1)\}$ and delete list $Del = Pre$.

- Calls from internal OR nodes n to children n' are represented by actions $start(n, n', i)$ with precondition

$$Pre = \{top(i), started(n, i)\} \cup \{\neg finished(n'', i+1) \mid n'' \in children(n)\} \cup \{\neg started(n'', i+1) \mid n'' \in children(n)\}$$

add list $Add = \{top(i+1), started(n', i+1)\}$ and delete list $Del = \{top(i)\}$.

- Termination of calls from internal OR nodes are represented by actions $end(n, n', i)$, where n' is a child of n, with precondition $Pre = \{top(i), started(n, i), finished(n', i)\}$, add list $Add = \{finished(n, i-1), top(i-1)\}$ and delete list $Del = Pre$.

- Root OR nodes are handled like other OR nodes, except that the action $end(n, i = 0)$ adds $finished(n, 0)$ rather than adding $finished(n, i-1)$.

For a plan π for $P_L(G)$, let us keep only the sequence of $start(n, n', k)$ actions where n is a leaf node of L, and let us set $f_L(\pi)$ to the corresponding sequence with the $start(n, n', k)$ actions replaced by the primitive actions associated with the nodes n.

The first result is about the correspondence between the set of plans in the library L for G with depth bounded by N, $\Pi^N_L(G)$, and the sequences of primitive actions $f(\pi)$ for plans π for $P^N_L(G)$:

Theorem 8 (Correspondence) *For a library L for goal G and a positive integer N, $\pi \in \Pi^N_L(G)$ iff there is a plan π' for $P_L(G)$ such that $\pi = f_L(\pi)$.*

The second result exploits this correspondence for computing the plans in the library that comply with a set of observations O using an off-the-shelf classical planner, suboptimal or not, over the problem $P'_L(G')$ obtained from $P_L(G)$ by compiling the observations O away (Definition 4):

Theorem 9 (Computation) *For a library L for a goal G, and a positive integer N, G has a plan in $\Pi^N_L(G)$ compatible with the observations O iff there is a plan for the Planning problem ${P'}^N_L(G')$ obtained from $P_L(G)$ by compiling the observations O away.*

The third result is semantic, and shows that this computational method follows from the general formulation for Plan Recognition from STRIPS theories when action costs are taken to be zero:

Theorem 10 (Subsumption) *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a set of possible goals, and let L be the library for $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Then G has a plan in the library that satisfies the observations O with depth no greater than N iff there is an* optimal plan *for the problem $P^N_L(G)$ that satisfies O, assuming action costs to be zero.*

Sequence	$\lvert O \rvert$	Time	Expanded	Plan Len	Algorithm
#1	2	0.2	32	12	EHC, BFS
#2	3	0.08	139	–	BFS
#3	6	0.08	172	–	BFS
#4	5	0.13	112	–	BFS

Table 1: Average time, number of nodes expanded for determining that a library was compatible with the observations, length of resulting explanations (plans) and algorithm used by FF – either EHC or BFS. $|O|$ is the size of the observation sequence. Derivation depth N was set to 5. Sequence #1 is {run-forward, kick}, sequence #2 is {run-forward, turn-to-player, kick}, sequence #3 is {run-forward, turn-away, kick-short, run-to-ball,turn-to-goal, kick } and sequence #4 consists in repeating five times the activity kick. None of the plan libraries account for the observation sequences #2, #3 and #4.

Indeed, this result follows from the one above, as when all action costs are zero, *any plan* for ${P'}^N_L(G')$ is an *optimal plan* for ${P'}^N_L(G)$, which in turn from Proposition 5, represents a plan for the problem $P_L(G)$ that satisfies the observations.

Experimental Results

We test below the Plan Recognition framework laid out above over plan libraries and Context-Free Grammars.

The Soccer Plan Library

From the descriptions found (Tambe et al. 1999) on plan hierarchies for controlling simulated RoboSoccer teams, we have defined ourselves a set plan libraries for recognizing the intentions of the opposing soccer team. Each library considers one of the following four root tasks, namely, *Frontal–Attack*, *Flank–Attack*, *Fight–Back* and *Fall–Back* [3]. Plans in the first two libraries share a substantial amount of activities, e.g. kicking the ball, or running towards the general direction of the opposing team, which do not or hardly take place in plans conveyed by the latter two libraries. In Figure 2 we show the plan library for the task *Frontal–Attack*.

In the experiments, we test which plan libraries are compatible with a sequence of observations drawn from a plan obtained from one of them. The planner we used to search for such plans is the satisfying classical planner FFV2.3.

In Table 1 we can see that the Planning problems we obtain from our compilation are handled easily by FF. It is important to note that the size of the observation sequence $|O|$ does not seem to be related with the running time. While the plan library depicted in Figure 2 might be very simple, it is not simpler than the plan libraries typically found in the Plan Recognition literature.

Context-Free Grammars

Context-free grammars (CFGs) appear to present more interesting Planning challenges than the common plan libraries. First, most, if not all, CFGs of interest in Natu-

[3] Names of tasks loosely correspond with those of top–level goals featured by the plan hierarchy found in the ISIS source distribution.



Figure 2: Plan library for *Frontal–Attack*. Nodes with elliptic shape are OR nodes or leaves (primitive tasks), box–shaped nodes are AND nodes. Precedence constraints between children of AND nodes are not shown.

Sentence	Time (secs)	Expanded	Plan Len	Algorithm
"Jack ate my cookie"	0.31	211	35	BFS
"ran the boy under the hill"	0.36	452	67	BFS
"Jack my cookie"	0.32	168	35	BFS
"the boy under the hill with my cookie ran"	0.44	1,722	–	BFS

Table 2: Time needed by FF to accept or reject input sentences, number of nodes expanded in each case, length of explanations (plans) and algorithm used by FF to find the solution. Note that sentences #2 and #3 are incomplete. In sentence #2 the sentence subject is missing, and in sentence #3 the verb is missing. There is no plan accounting for sentence #4.

Sentence Type	Time (secs)	Expanded	Plan Len	Algorithm
Covered	266.5, TO(1)	1,698	54.2	BFS
Incomplete	271	393	34	BFS
Not Covered	TO	4,000	–	–

Table 3: Average time, number of nodes expanded – for timeouts an educated guess is provided – and plan lengths obtained with the second grammar. TO stands for timeout (time limit was set to 600 seconds). Twelve sentences were divided into three sets. The *Covered* set contained full sentences covered by the grammar. The *Incomplete* set contained covered sentences with missing tokens. The final set, *Not Covered*, refers to non–English sequences of tokens.

ral Language Processing (NLP) are cyclic, though in languages like English, the depth of the derivation is not big. On the other hand, CFGs used as benchmarks for parsers, like ATIS–3 or COMMANDTALK [4], feature thousands of rules. Compiling such grammars into Plan Libraries results in graphs with several thousand nodes. Until recently (Geib and Goldman 2009), there has not been any serious attempt at developing a set of challenging benchmarks for Plan Recognition algorithms.

We have tested our compilation in a toy CFG of the English language, described below:

1. $S \rightarrow NP\ VP$
2. $VP \rightarrow V\ NP|V|VP\ PP$
3. $NP \rightarrow Det\ N|Name|NP\ PP$
4. $PP \rightarrow P\ NP$
5. $V \rightarrow saw|ate|ran$
6. $N \rightarrow boy|cookie|table|telescope|hill$
7. $Name \rightarrow Jack|Bob$
8. $P \rightarrow with|under$
9. $Det \rightarrow the|a|my$

Compiling this simple CFG yields a Plan Library with 85 nodes, which in turn yields a Planning problem with about 800 actions after having fixed the maximum derivation depth to 10.

Table 2 confirms our intuition that even very simple CFGs yield significantly more challenging Planning problems than Plan Libraries do. In general more search is required to find a parse tree for the input token sequence. One very interesting property inherent to our approach is its ability to "interpolate" missing tokens from the input sentence, as is the case of sentence #3. In that sentence there is no verb, and the planner introduces one of the available productions for non–terminal V in order to obtain a correct parse tree. In sentence #2 the subject is missing, and in this case the planner introduces a noun–phrase.

Encouraged by these results, we wanted to conduct an experiment with a "real grammar". We aimed at obtaining a parse for sentences using the ATIS–3 benchmark CFG. Yet this grammar contains over 3,000 different production rules, which resulted in an AND/OR graph with over 6,000 nodes. The Planning problem resulting from compiling that graph featured over 300,000 actions and a disk footprint of about 2 Gigabytes.

We have thus tested our Plan Recognition framework over a CFG not as complex as ATIS–3 but a bit more complex than the toy CFG above. This second grammar features a much richer lexicon: 7 verbs with tenses and number, over twenty nouns, pronouns, auxiliary verbs and all of English prepositions. It also features rules for modeling pragmatics – statements, questions and commands – and taking as well into account applicable syntactic cases – declarative, imperative and interrogation – for each pragmatic. This second grammar, when compiled, resulted in an AND/OR graph with 251 nodes, which, after fixing the derivation depth N to 30 to ensure solubility, resulted in a Planning problem with over 10,000 actions.

[4] These grammars can be found in the NLTK (`http://www.nltk.org`) Natural Language Processing toolkit corpora.

The results of applying our scheme to this second grammar are shown in Table 3, where three types of sentences are considered. Interestingly FF, solved pretty well the sentences in the *Covered* set, but had trouble processing the non–English token sequences in the *Not Covered* set. The timeout we get in the *Covered* set corresponds to the sentence "why did you take the book", while the sentence "take the book" was solved after having to expand just 441 nodes. This observation and the fact that incomplete sentences are much smaller than the average sentence in the *Complete* set, leads us to conclude that in the context of parsing as Planning, the length of the sentence to parse seems to be relevant for the hardness of the problem. We can also see that the "interpolating" behavior of our scheme is biased towards providing a reasonably sized parse tree. It is also worthy to note that none of the problems was solved with the incomplete EHC procedure.

The result confirms that the search for plans in the resulting theories becomes much more expensive due to the limitations of current heuristics that make planners like FF get lost in much larger search spaces. Moreover, we have found that it is possible to incorporate some ideas from parsing algorithms like CYK (Younger 1967) into relaxed–plan graph heuristics, while keeping the heuristic itself computable in polynomial time. We think that such heuristics will help the search to become more focused. Interestingly, the new heuristic is general and thus applies to Planning problems that are completely unrelated to parsing. Unfortunately, we haven't had the time to test these ideas yet, but would like to do that for the camera–ready version if the paper is accepted for the workshop.

Discussion

We have shown that the framework for plan recognition over STRIPS theories, formulated recently in (Ramirez and Geffner 2009), subsumes the Plan Recognition problem over libraries, as they can be compiled into STRIPS. We have also shown that recognition over standard libraries become Planning problems that can be easily solved by modern planners, while recognition over more complex libraries, including CFGs, illustrate limitations of current Planning heuristics and suggest improvements that may be relevant in other Planning problems as well (to be worked out and shown).

References

[Avrahami-Zilberbrand and Kaminka 2005] Avrahami-Zilberbrand, D., and Kaminka, G. A. 2005. Fast and complete symbolic plan recognition. In *Proceedings of IJCAI*, 653–658.

[Baker, Tenenbaum, and Saxe 2007] Baker, C. L.; Tenenbaum, J. B.; and Saxe, R. R. 2007. Goal inference as inverse planning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*.

[Charniak and Goldman 1993] Charniak, E., and Goldman, R. P. 1993. A bayesian model of plan recognition. *Artificial Intelligence* 64:53–79.

[Cohen, Perrault, and Allen 1981] Cohen, P. R.; Perrault, C. R.; and Allen, J. F. 1981. Beyond question answering. In Lehnert, W., and Ringle, M., eds., *Strategies for Natural Language Processing*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[Gazen and Knoblock 1997] Gazen, B., and Knoblock, C. 1997. Combining the expressiveness of UCPOP with the efficiency of Graphplan. In Steel, S., and Alami, R., eds., *Recent Advances in AI Planning. Proc. 4th European Conf. on Planning (ECP-97). Lect. Notes in AI 1348*, 221–233. Springer.

[Geib and Goldman 2009] Geib, C. W., and Goldman, R. P. 2009. A probabilistic plan recognition algorithm based on plan tree grammars. *Artificial Intelligence* 173:1101–1132.

[Goldman, Geib, and Miller 1999] Goldman, R. P.; Geib, C. W.; and Miller, C. A. 1999. A new model of plan recognition. In *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*.

[Kautz and Allen 1986] Kautz, H., and Allen, J. F. 1986. Generalized plan recognition. In *AAAI*, 32–37.

[Lesh and Etzioni 1995] Lesh, N., and Etzioni, O. 1995. A sound and fast goal recognizer. In *Proc. IJCAI-95*, 1704–1710.

[Pentney et al. 2006] Pentney, W.; Popescu, A.; Wang, S.; Kautz, H.; and Philipose, M. 2006. Sensor-based understanding of daily life via large-scale use of common sense. In *Proceedings of AAAI*.

[Ramirez and Geffner 2009] Ramirez, M., and Geffner, H. 2009. Plan recognition as planning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-09)*.

[Schmidt, Sridharan, and Goodson 1978] Schmidt, C.; Sridharan, N.; and Goodson, J. 1978. The plan recognition problem: an intersection of psychology and artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence* 11:45–83.

[Tambe et al. 1999] Tambe, M.; Adibi, J.; Al-Onaizan, Y.; Erdem, A.; Kaminka, G. A.; Marsella, S. C.; and Muslea, I. 1999. Building Agent Teams Using an Explicit Teamwork Model and Learning. *Artifical Intelligence* 110:215–239.

[Vilain 1990] Vilain, M. 1990. Getting serious about parsing plans: A grammatical analysis of plan recognition. In *Proceedings of the Eighth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 190–197.

[Younger 1967] Younger, D. H. 1967. Recognition and parsing of context–free languages in time n^3. *Information and Control* 10:189–208.